

IN THE DRAWINGS:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Figures. 4 and 7A. These sheets, which include Figures 4 and 7A, replaces the original sheets including Figures 4 and 7A. In Figure 4, previously omitted element 120 has been added. In Figure 7A, previously omitted element 106a has been added.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets
Annotated Sheets Showing Changes

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated January 26, 2006, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on April 26, 2006. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

The specification has been amended to correct minor editorial problems. In amended Figure 4, the previously omitted element numeral 120 has been added. In amended Figure 7A, previously omitted element numeral 106a has been added. The reference to end effector 106 on page 24, line 4 has been corrected to refer to Figure 6. The reference to "containment vessel" has been changed to "fluid handling system" on page 6 at line 9. Element numeral 122b on page 24, line 14 now refers to Figure 5. Reference numeral 102a has been deleted on page 25 at line 28. Element Z has been amended to reference Figures 2A-2C on page 30 at line 28. The reference to "lower opening 135 (Fig. 3B)" has been changed to "lower opening 135" on page 24, line 11.

Claims 134 - 149 remain pending in the application and are shown above. Claims 1 - 133 have been cancelled by Applicants. New claims 146-149 have been added. Claims 134 - 145 stand rejected by the Examiner. Reconsideration of the rejected claims is requested for reasons presented below.

Claim 134 is amended to clarify the invention. Claim 134 is amended to require the source of process fluid to be moveable between a closed position and an open position. Support for the amendment can be found on page 7, lines 15-17 of the specification as originally filed. Support for new claims 146-149 can be found at claims 72, 77, 134, and Figure 1C. These amendments are not presented to distinguish a reference, thus, the claims as amended are entitled to a full range of equivalents if not previously amended to distinguish a reference.

Claims 134, 135, 137, 141, 143, and 145 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,273,100 to Andreas et al. (Andreas), on grounds that Andreas discloses an apparatus for treating and drying a substrate comprising a recirculation system fluidly coupled to the lower portion of the chamber. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Andreas does not teach, show, or suggest the source of process fluid to be moveable between a closed position and an open position. Therefore, Andreas, alone or in combination, does not teach, show, or suggest the source of process fluid to be moveable between a closed position and an open position, as recited in claim 134, and claims dependent thereon. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested. Additionally, Andreas does not teach, show, or suggest means for causing turbulent flow as required by new claim 146.

Claim 138 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,273,100 to Andreas et al. (Andreas) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,311,702 to Fishkin. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 138 depends from claim 134, which is believed to be allowable for the reasons stated above. Therefore, it is believed that claim 138 should be allowable as well.

Claims 136, 139, 142, and 144 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,273,100 to Andreas et al. (Andreas) in view U.S. Patent No. 6,328,814 to Fishkin et al. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 136, 139, 142, and 144 depend from claim 134, which is believed to be allowable for the reasons stated above. Therefore, it is believed that claims 136, 139, 142, and 144 should be allowable as well.

Claims 134-142 stand rejected under nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting over U.S. Patent No. 6,726,848. Applicants have filed herewith a terminal disclaimer.

In conclusion, the references cited by the Examiner, alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest the invention as claimed.

The secondary references made of record are noted. However, it is believed that the secondary references are no more pertinent to the Applicants' disclosure than the primary references cited in the office action. Therefore, Applicants believe that a detailed discussion of the secondary references is not necessary for a full and complete response to this office action.

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



Keith M. Tackett
Registration No. 32,008
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicants

(w/attachments)




FIG. 4

